

## REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected.

Claim 1 is amended herein.

Claims 2-5 are canceled herein.

New Claim 6 is presented.

Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

### Claim rejection 35 U.S.C. 112, Second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, in Claim 1 the Examiner stated that “said at least one wire aperture” lacks antecedent basis. It is believed that the amendment herein to Claim 1 alleviates this issue. The Claim has been amended to indicate that “at least one wire is inserted through said at least one of said plurality of wire aperture apertures. “At least one of said plurality of wire aperture” clearly has antecedent basis in the claim. It should be noted that Claim 5 has been canceled.

### Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. First paragraph

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner has objected to the use of the term “tensioning bar” as misleading. It is believed that the Applicant herein has alleviated the source of the ambiguity. Specifically, and in

accordance with the recommendation of the Examiner, the Applicant herein has amended the term "tensioning bar" to read "compress". Furthermore, in each instance of the use of the word tension, this has been replaced by the term compression.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) and 35 U.S.C. 103 (a)

The Examiner has rejected the claims as filed and has taken the position that they were anticipated by the prior art, or would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the application was filed. It is believed that none of the prior art of record anticipates the Claims as amended nor renders any of the presently presented Claims obvious to one skilled in the art.

None of the prior art cited by the Examiner has the unique combination of elements that are presented in the wire stripper as claimed herein. The Examiner has taken the position that McClellan (U.S. Patent No. 6,018,873) contains all of the elements of the claimed invention. The applicant disagrees. Specifically, the Examiner has taken the position that element 38 of McClellan can be considered a compress. The Applicant submits that this is not the case especially in light of the amendment herein which recites compress bar. McClellan clearly does not comprise a compress bar. An examination of McClellan's description indicates that element 38 is a set screw, not a compress bar. As such, McClellan clearly does not include each and every element of the present invention as claimed.

Furthermore, the applicant herein is claiming his invention to include a plurality of wire apertures. McClellan does not include a plurality of wire apertures, rather a single

one. Moreover, the applicant submits that none of the prior art of record includes or suggest a plurality of wire apertures.

In addition, the applicant herein has amended the claims to indicate that the plurality of wire aperture include wire apertures of varying diameters. Neither McClellan nor any of the prior art of record include or suggest this element. As such, the present invention as described and claimed herein has the capability to simultaneously strip multiple wires and or varying gauges. McClellan's invention cannot accomplish this feat, nor can any other wire stripper of record.

With regard to new claim 6, the applicant has included the requirements that 1) the wire stripper include blade receiving slots positioned off center relative to the corresponding wire aperture; 2) a bore that extends from said first side face to said second side face of the wire stripping block; and 3) a blade securing rod inserted through said bore for retaining said blades in position. None of the prior art of record includes nor fairly suggest these elements.

The Applicant has carefully considered all of the prior art of record including the prior art cited by the Examiner. The Applicant has carefully read:

1. McClellan - U.S. Patent No. 6,018,873
2. Bourbeau - U.S. Patent No. 5,561,903
3. Holder - U.S. Patent No. 5,571,150
4. Alexander - U.S. Patent No. 6,161,289
5. Bianco - U.S. Patent No. 4,463,494

None of these references include all of the elements as claimed in Claims 1 and New Claim 6. Specifically, none of these references include a stripping block that includes

multiple wire apertures for simultaneously stripping multiple wires and of varying diameters. As such, it is believed that both of the Claims as presented are allowable claims.

#### Conclusion

It is believed that the applicant herein successfully has addressed all of the issues raised by the Examiner in the Office Action. For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that the wire stripper as described and claimed herein is not fairly taught by any of the references of record, taken either alone or in combination. Therefore allowance of the present application is in order and is respectfully requested. Should there be any outstanding issues that can be resolved by a phone call to the undersigned attorney, the Examiner is cordially invited to do so.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel Kirshner  
Registration Number 38,516  
Attorney for applicant  
199 Route 18 South  
East Brunswick, NJ 08816  
Ph.) 732-828-8340